

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-9 are pending in the application. Claims 1-8 are rejected. Claim 9 is new.

The Examiner's acknowledgement of receipt of the claim for priority and all priority documents is noted with appreciation. The Examiner's acceptance of the drawing(s) is respectfully requested.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner in that the Title is not descriptive. A new, more descriptive title is currently provided.

Claims 1-3 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hansler et al. US patent 4,935,668 (herein 'Hansler').

Hansler discloses a metal halide lamp having a glass vacuum shroud (48) which surrounds and protects the inner envelope (46) where the gas discharge takes place. In the embodiment shown in Fig. 5, the unnumbered lowermost surface of the inner envelope (46) is flat.

In contrast, the lowermost surface (10, 11) of Applicant's discharge vessel has a raised central first portion 10 which is surrounded by a relatively lowered second portion 11.

Accordingly, in order to more clearly define the invention, claim 1 is currently amended to call for the bottom surface (10, 11) that is lowermost in the operational position of the lamp to have a raised central first portion 10 which is surrounded by a relatively lowered second portion 11. Support for this limitation may be found, e.g., at page 4, lines 26-29 of Applicant's specification.

Regarding claim 2, Hansler specifically teaches the presence of mercury in the lamp, contrary to the assertion of

Amendment/Response

Reply to non-Final Office action of 17 January 2007
the Examiner. See col. 5, lines 38 and 39.

Regarding claim 3, Hansler discloses exemplary volumes for the chamber 48c between the shroud and the inner envelope, but does not disclose any volumes for the inner envelope. He does give exemplary linear dimensions at col. 5, lines 3-9, but these dimensions are not for the embodiment of Fig. 5. Applicant can find no disclosure regarding the dimension or volume of the inner envelope of the embodiment of Fig. 5.

Regarding claims 7 and 9, Hansler discloses the presence of Xe at a pressure of 2-15 atmospheres, which is approximately equal to 2-15 bar. However, this is not the same as Applicant's claimed ranges of 8-20 bar, and 10-15 bar. Applicant operates in a higher pressure range whose lower limits are substantially above the lower limit of 2 atmospheres disclosed by Hansler.

In order to anticipate a claim under Section 102, a reference must show all of the limitations claimed, not just some of them.

Hansler fails to disclose this feature of a raised central portion of the lowermost wall of the discharge vessel, and thus fails to anticipate the rejected claims. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Haacke et al. US patent 6,815,889 (herein 'Haacke').

Haacke discloses a high-pressure gas discharge lamp which in one embodiment shows a raised central portion (11) of the lowermost wall of the discharge vessel in the operating position.

Claim 1 is currently amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 3, and claim 3 is cancelled. Claim 1 thus now calls for the volume of the discharge space (2) to be approximately 18 pl.

Amendment/Response

Reply to non-Final Office action of 17 January 2007

Haacke discloses that the volume of the discharge space in the embodiments of his invention is 20 μ l. Accordingly, Haacke fails to anticipate Applicant's claimed invention.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Haacke fails to disclose the claimed limitations. Haacke's disclosed amount of light-generating substances of 300 μ g is not the same as, and is substantially different from, Applicant's claimed amount of 200 μ g, and Haacke's disclosed dimension of 0.5 mm for the height of the raised central portion is not the same as, and is substantially less than, Applicant's claimed dimension of 1 mm.

In order to anticipate a claim under Section 102, a reference must show all of the limitations claimed, not just some of them.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all of the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,


John C. Fox, Reg. 24,975
Consulting Patent Attorney
315-828-6292